



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

July 11, 2003

Ms. Pamela Smith
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P. O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2003-4794

Dear Ms. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 184042.

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received several requests for information related to a specific traffic accident. You state that a copy of the Accident Report will be released to the requestor. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108;

...

(5) all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (5). The submitted documents include completed reports, which we have marked. The completed reports are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Furthermore, other documents, which we have also marked, constitute working papers used to estimate the expenditure of public funds by a governmental body. If the estimates associated with these documents have been completed, the documents are public under section 552.022(a)(5). As prescribed by section 552.022, the documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1) must be released to the requestor unless they are confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108.¹ Further, the department may not withhold the documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(5), if the estimates associated with these documents have been completed, unless such information is confidential under other law. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception under the Public Information Act and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect a governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the documents subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103.

However, portions of the information in the documents made public under section 552.022 are confidential under sections 552.117 and 552.130 of the Government Code. Because sections 552.117 and 552.130 are mandatory exceptions, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the documents subject to section 552.022. Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information that reveals a peace officer's home address, home telephone number, social security number, and whether the officer has family members. "Peace officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The department must withhold the peace officer's home address, which we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(2).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a driver's license or motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. Accordingly, we have marked the information in the documents made public under section 552.022 that the department must withhold pursuant to section 552.130.

¹Because you do not raise section 552.108, we do not address the applicability of this exception to disclosure.

We will now address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The department has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The department must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.² Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit

²In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

This office has held that a governmental body reasonably anticipates litigation when it receives a claim letter and affirmatively represents to this office that the claim letter complies with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civil Practices and Remedies Code chapter 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance. Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996). You state that on April 14, 2003 the requestor filed a letter of representation and a notice of claim on behalf of his client. You further state that "[t]he Department believes this letter meets the notice requirements under the Texas Tort Claims Act." You have provided this office with a copy of this letter. As the department received the present requests on April 24, 2003, we conclude that the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present requests, and thus, it has met the first prong of the section 552.103 test. Further, we conclude that the remaining submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103, and is therefore excepted from disclosure under this section.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

To summarize, we conclude that (1) with the exception of the information we have marked under sections 552.117 and 552.130, the department must release the documents subject to sections 552.022(a)(1) and 552.022(a)(5) of the Government Code, and (2) the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah Swanson", with a stylized, flowing script.

Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 184042

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim S. Adler
Attorneys at Law
City Place Center East, Lock Box 40
2711 North Haskell Avenue, Suite 2100
Dallas, Texas 75204-2910
(w/o enclosures)